



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/659,344	09/11/2003	Alexander Pakhomov		7106

7590 01/03/2005
Ilya Zborovsky
6 Schoolhouse Way
Dix Hills, NY 11746

EXAMINER


LAI, ANNE VIET NGA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2636

DATE MAILED: 01/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<p align="center">Office Action Summary</p>	<p>Application No.</p> <p align="center">10/659,344</p>	<p>Applicant(s)</p> <p align="center">PAKHOMOV ET AL. </p>	
	<p>Examiner</p> <p align="center">Anne V. Lai</p>	<p>Art Unit</p> <p align="center">2636</p>	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on September 11, 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1 and 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Blum et al** [US. 5,237,408] in view of **Wilson** [US. 4,121,192].

Regarding claim 1, **Blum et al** (figs. 1 and 2; col. 3, lines 13-39) disclose a system for detecting of an intruder (digital video surveillance system DVSS 10), comprising a plurality groups of sensors connected in parallel with one another (alarm sensors 18, access control detectors 22); a plurality of individual processing units (alarm computer 20, access control computer 24) each connected with a respective one of said groups of sensors, the individual processing units are connected in parallel with one another (fig. 1); a central processing unit (controller 32; fig. 2) connected with all parallel-connected processing units so that each of the individual processing units can obtain information about a presence of an intruder near any of said groups of sensors; and means (plural cameras 12; figs. 1-2) for obtaining a visual image of the intruder near any of said groups of sensors and transmitting the image to the central processing unit.

Blum et al do not disclose the type of sensor used for detecting intruder; **Wilson** teaches a system for detecting of an intruder comprising an array of sensors including seismic, acoustic and seismic-acoustic sensors (col. 11, line 11 through col. 12, line 11). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made the type sensors used for detecting intruder is selected merely based on designer preference, convenient of supply or reduced cost.

Regarding claims 3-5, **Blum et al** disclose each group of sensors (18, 22; fig. 1) being connected with a respective one of the individual processing units (20, 24; fig. 1) by a single line; the individual processing units (20, 24) are connected in parallel with one another; the central processing unit (controller 32; fig. 1) connected with all parallel-connected processing units (external security computers) by a single line (through I/O interface 41).

3. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Blum et al** and **Wilson** in view of **Wymore** [US. 6,515,586].

Regarding claim 2, **Wilson** (abstract) teaches utilizing an array of spaced sensors for determining the intruder direction and position; **Wymore** (fig. 3) suggests an array of sensors comprising at least two group of sensors (202) extended substantially in a same direction, spaced from one another, and connected to a single respective one of the individual processing units (controller 110), so that signals produced by the two groups of sensors and received by the respective one of said individual processing units are indicative of a direction from which an intruder crosses an area covered (col. 5, lines 3-6).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made, the use of more than one group of sensors to detect intruder direction provides more accuracy when the intruder detection system is used to supervise a large area.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Kyle, Jr. discloses an intrusion alarm with signal processing and channel identification two group of sensors connected to a processing unit. [US. 3,774,190]

Chleboum discloses an intrusion detection system comprising an array of several multisensor units. [US. 4,107,660]

Werth discloses a pattern processing system comprises a selection of plural sensors and the individual processing units are connected in parallel. [US. 4,541,115]

Everett, Jr. et al disclose an intelligent security assessment system comprising a group of sensors of different types connected to a local computer. [4,857,912]


5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anne V. Lai whose telephone number is 571-272-2974. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am to 5:30 pm, Monday to Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hofsass Jeffery can be reached on 571-272-2981. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A. V. Lai *AVL*

December 20, 2004


JEFFERY HOFSSASS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600